

and sent that bill here—both those bills—and we have not acted. We have walked away.

Mr. Speaker, we have made our point: Walking away has been the practice of this Congress. Not getting the work done has been the practice of this Congress. How lamentable it is for the American people. But as President Obama said: They have a choice. May they make it well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Republican leadership in the House on their two greatest accomplishments this Congress: 1) thanks to their leadership, we have had the least productive Congress in modern history and 2) thanks to their leadership Congress has the lowest approval rating ever.

Time and time again, the House Republicans showed Americans that they would rather play politics by putting messaging bills on the Floor than never stood a chance of passing in the Senate than work with us and the Senate on legislation our country desperately needs.

House Republicans found time to vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act 33 times but we can't find the time to extend the Farm Bill.

In fact, halfway through 2012, the House Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR declared that "serious legislating is all but done until after the election."

This is not what Americans want and the majority should be ashamed of themselves for creating an environment where compromise is avoided at all costs.

Mr. Speaker, I have served many years in the House of Representatives and am proud of the fact that I often work with my colleagues across the aisle to find solutions that make sense for my constituents, industry and the environment.

But this Congress, it's been different. Their mentality is that you're either with us or against us. But Mr. Speaker, that is no way to lead a chamber that represents various constituencies around the country.

#### PERSPECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, well, my head is spinning a bit after hearing my friends across the aisle. I heard our former Speaker ask about whether we're better off now than we were 4 years ago, and actually ask how can people who perpetuated this economic disaster ask that question. And it was amazing, because former Speaker PELOSI and I were on exactly the same wavelength. She was asking: Are we better off now than we were 4 years ago? And I was thinking the same thing that she was: How could people who perpetuated this economic disaster ask that question? But she asked it anyway.

You heard our friends talk about the economic disaster. Some of us remember back into the early point of the

21st century when there was an effort by first-term President Bush, George W. Bush, calling for reform of Fannie and Freddie, and I seem to recall my friend from Massachusetts who resisted such reform. In fact, there were people here on the Democratic side of the aisle that resisted such reform; they prevented such reform. There were Members on the Republican side—not all of them, but there were Members who were calling for reform of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, but it didn't happen. In fact, our friends across the aisle were in control of the House and Senate for 4 years.

In 2005 and 2006, as a freshman, I often heard our colleagues across the aisle asking how we could do such a terrible, terrible thing of spending 100 to \$200 billion more than we had coming in. And they were right, they were right: we should not have been spending \$160 billion more than we had coming in. The Democrats were right. And because Republicans did not stay true to what we had promised—our leadership just wouldn't dig in and stop it, even though we had a Republican President, you know, well, we've got a Republican President, don't want to hurt his feelings—we spent \$160 billion more than we had coming in.

So, the American public sounded like they weren't thrilled with what they heard from the Democrats, but they figured they'd give them a chance. So, November 2006, Democrats—who had promised to end the deficit spending—took over and the deficit spending, rather than coming under control, went out of sight.

□ 1330

They passed the Dodd-Frank bill. It has historic overregulation of community banks.

Now, why would a group who is so upset with Wall Street pass legislation that devastates community banks that are closest to the community, know the borrowers the best, that have been the real foundation of this country? Why would they strangle out community banks with this massive overregulation that really doesn't hurt the massive, big banks?

Well, someone said years ago, follow the money. And if you look at the money that has been contributed to campaigns for many years, you find out that the Wall Street executives and their immediate family normally donate about four times more to Democrats than they do to Republicans.

Now, the Wall Street executives have to endure being called fat cats by a Democratic President, but they know, perhaps it's a wink and a nod, I'll call you fat cats, but I'm going to destroy your competition. We'll get rid of community banks. We'll strangle them with overregulation. They can't make loans. We'll threaten them through the FDIC and the regulators to prevent them from making loans that they know are to good, reliable people who have never missed a payment. We'll

threaten them not to do that, and we'll choke them out. And the only people to be left are the big investment banks on Wall Street that got us into the big mess in the first place.

So if you follow the money and you follow the contributions, you find out, gee, Democrats talk about Wall Street as if they're Republicans, but there are four times more Democrats on Wall Street as executives than there are Republicans. What a shock. Because they talk a good game, I thought for so long that Wall Street executives must be Republicans, the way the Democrats talk. Not so. President Obama got four times more contributions from executives and their immediate family than did a guy named JOHN MCCAIN.

So, we look on further. What about jobs?

How about when we have a disaster, by British Petroleum, who has been allowed to operate in the gulf coast with 800 or so egregious safety violations, but that's okay. According to the Obama administration, they didn't want to step in.

I read an account that at the very time *Deepwater Horizon* had blown out, and this administration, Obama administration, should have been all over them, the executives of British Petroleum were negotiating with the Democrats to be the one big oil company that rolled out support in favor of cap-and-trade.

I said I wouldn't use the term "crap-and-trade" anymore, so I'll avoid saying that.

But they had a big oil company that was willing to come out and support cap-and-trade. So certainly this administration and the Democrats in the House and Senate wouldn't want to do anything too detrimental to British Petroleum because they're going to come out on our side. That meant that they ended up actually believing BP when they said, Oh, we'll get it under control.

Well, they didn't get it under control.

So then there was this bipartisan group of experts peer-reviewing what was going on in the gulf coast, and they came back with a report that made recommendations of what should be done. One of those recommendations was not to have a moratorium on drilling, not only of the deep water, but also the very shallow water. They didn't recommend it. And yet this administration goes through and changes the report the way it's printed and put out so that it makes it sound like these experts recommended a moratorium. They did not. But that's the way this administration wanted to manipulate what the American public believed so that the President could sign off on a moratorium.

Other than those precious lives that were lost and those who were harmed out there on the *Deepwater Horizon* rig because this administration had allowed them to continue to operate, the biggest damage to the people in the gulf area was from the President's moratorium.

There were people who were making \$75,000 in salary working on rigs—and that was the minimum, basically, from what I was told by people that worked on rigs—and that income stopped, and those families had nothing because this President perverted a report into making people believe that it said we should cut off drilling in the gulf coast, and it devastated so many in the gulf coast region.

If you want to look at what the President really thinks about big oil companies, it's very similar to what is said and done about Wall Street. They call the Wall Street executives all kinds of names—wink, wink, nod, nod. We're going to pass legislation that eliminates your competition, and then you'll be in charge, and then maybe you can make eight times as many contributions to Democrats as you do to Republicans in both Wall Street and among Big Oil.

How would that happen?

Well, if you read the bill that President Obama put together—and it was the second American Jobs Act that was filed, because I filed the first one, because he ran around the country for weeks saying, Pass the American Jobs Act. There wasn't one filed. I figure if he's going to run around America saying, Pass the American Jobs Act, there ought to be one. So I put a two-page bill together that would have eliminated the 35 percent tariff we put on every American-made good by any company in America.

If we eliminate that 35 percent tariff, also called a corporate tax, you would see companies flocking into America. You would see people with jobs. They wouldn't be standing in line trying to get food stamps, standing in line trying to get more government help. They would have a job and all the pride that comes from that, of doing a good job and making your own money and making your own way.

But we have a group in this Congress, in both ends. They're in the majority down in the Senate, in the minority down here; and it's certainly not all of my Democratic friends, but they think the best way to help a country is just to give away more of other people's money.

If you look at the President's proposal in his so-called American Jobs Act, he told people, I'm going to just really take after Big Oil.

Well, I was one who actually read all 135 or 138 pages, whatever it was, and in the last part is where he got around to Big Oil, except it doesn't hurt Big Oil. It absolutely devastates and would eliminate all the small independent oil companies operating in America. And those small independent oil companies happen to drill and operate nearly 95 percent of all the oil and gas wells in America.

He takes away deductions of the normal cost of doing business that anybody in business is allowed to take as a deduction. Why not? It's the cost of doing business. It's not profit. That

way, you only tax the profit. And it eliminates deductions that actually do not help big oil companies. They can't take those deductions. Only the small companies can take that deduction.

So the President's plan, when you really look at it, instead of looking at what he says, look at what he did. What he did was provide the elimination of the independent oil and gas companies in America.

And you don't have to have been to an Ivy League school. In fact, you're better off maybe in figuring this out if you didn't, because he had a Harvard economic advisor at the time. And of course, Art Laffer, I think the world of him. I think he's maybe the best economic advisor any President's ever had, despite his Harvard education. But you don't have to have an Ivy League education to understand that if this President had been successful in eliminating every independent oil and gas company, as his bill would have done, not only will you eliminate millions of jobs, including those who derive jobs from the independent oil and gas business as well as the business itself, not only would you do that, you would eliminate most of the production in America.

What does that do? That drives the price of oil and gasoline way up, dramatically up. Natural gas, oil, all of that goes dramatically up, because the major oil companies in the world are not interested in coming in and operating smaller wells. They go for the big ones.

□ 1340

That means there is no competition to the massive oil and gas companies in the world. I was shocked to find out in our Natural Resources Committee that, if you look at all of the big oil companies in the world and if you see them listed just by how much they've got in reserves, the American companies like Exxon are way down the list. The biggest oil companies are those operating as single companies in OPEC nations.

And what would this President do?

He would do what he has done repeatedly—he would help foreign countries. He would help the bigger folks, the bigger oil companies. I'm sure it would have benefited the fat cats, as he calls them, on Wall Street, but it would have put out of business 94, 95 percent of the oil and gas wells in America. That meant everybody's price went up. How sad is it that one of the few promises that he kept—I don't know, it may be the main promise—was to drive up the cost of energy in America. Boy, has he done that.

Now, I love having quotes from people who talk about the Congress being the worst Congress that they can recall, especially Republicans, when the body at the other end of the Hall has not fulfilled the obligation that they are required by law to do, and that's to pass a budget. Not in over 3 years. So how are we going to get anything done in Congress?

We've got a Senate down there, controlled by Democrats, who say, We're not going to do our job, and we're going to leave over and over on recess, and we're never going to do our job because, if people saw what our budget really is, they'd get mad at us, so we don't want a budget. We just want to keep spending at these ridiculously high levels. If we work through a budget, we might have to do like the House did when they worked through a budget, and we may actually have to cut some things.

How incredibly disingenuous for anyone in America to stand up and say, Gee, we really want to bring down our spending, and yet everything they propose, except for the military, creates more spending. How disingenuous for anybody in America who stands up and says, These Republicans want to cut Medicare; they're going to destroy Medicare, if they've been awake during any of the actual bills that have been passed by the Democrats, especially during that whole long ordeal when the Democrats had the House and they had the Senate and they had the White House, and when America made it clear we do not want ObamaCare. They said, We don't care. We want it. It's going to be more government control.

It really was about the GRE, the government running everything, not just health care. By the passage of ObamaCare without one single Republican vote—not a one; it was completely done with Democratic votes, this \$716 billion in cuts to Medicare—the Democrats voted that in. The Democratic President signed it in. It devastates Medicare more than anything that has ever been done to Medicare, and it was without one single Republican vote.

So how in the world could somebody come in here or anywhere and blame Republicans for wanting to cut Medicare? Now, I blame my leadership. Anybody who is around can find it.

We should never have agreed with the Democrats to that stupid supercommittee, deficit ceiling bill. We should not have. I was assured, No, no, no. They don't want \$300 billion or \$400 billion—\$500 billion in cuts in Medicare, which would be a sequester. They will come together, and we'll reach an agreement. I pointed out that these are the same people who cut \$716 billion out of Medicare in ObamaCare. So, of course. I pointed out, if they don't have this supercommittee structure and refuse to let there be any agreement, then there is no one in the country who can be blamed for cutting Medicare except the Democrats.

But if they get this bill passed on the deficit-raising bill and if it requires a supercommittee to reach an agreement—if they can get that through and get us to go along with it, thinking that they're going to actually reach an agreement—then they can stonewall and not reach an agreement no matter what we offer, and then they get a twofer. They get hundreds of billions in

cuts to our national security at a time when our national security has not been in this kind of jeopardy since 9/11. Actually, on 9/11 it wasn't in the kind of jeopardy we are in right now, today.

Under this administration, we have seen a win in Iraq turned into a loss because of just the total abandonment of what we created in the way of a friend in Iraq. Maliki—now, he's no friend of mine. He says I can't come back in the country. Yet if I put myself in Maliki's situation, who is the leader of Iraq—and I know Obama has said we're leaving and we're not leaving anybody or anything; we're leaving—and if you see America is pulling out and if you see all this radical stuff going on across the border in Iran, well, you realize America is not going to be around to keep any stability, and I'm going to have to start doing what Iran says.

So what did we do?

We created a country. We had a victory. Even though President Obama, as a Senator, was against the surge, everybody said it worked, that we'd won. Then he pulled us out in such a way that he snatched defeat out of the jaws of victory. Now you've got Iraq that is under heavy influence by Iran. Thank you, President Obama. We've got Syria that is run by a tyrant. Perhaps Syria was the only place we should have intervened, and this President still hasn't gone in and helped there—oh, no. Because the 57 States that make up the Organization of the Islamic Conference were all for us going into Egypt and going into Libya and taking out two people with whom this administration had agreements. They loved the idea of America taking out and helping take out people that were allies of ours. They loved that.

Some of us in this body were saying, Don't do this. We don't know who's going to take over. These could be some radicals who will even empower the radicals more. I mean, you look across at Tunisia and Libya and Egypt and Iraq and Iran and Syria and Lebanon. You look at these countries and come on over to Afghanistan—that this President is losing as we speak—and Pakistan, which has been harming us all they could while still taking our money. Thank you, Secretary of State Clinton and President Obama. You look, and you go, oh, my gosh. This is the makings. This is the massive beginning of a new Ottoman Empire that President Obama can take great credit for. Yes, we're in big trouble here in America, but, wow, look what he has helped do in the Middle East. It's a new Ottoman Empire. Thank you, President Barack Hussein Obama. This will be quite a legacy for you.

I'm not one of those who says he is not a Christian. All I know is that's between him and God. What I do know is he has helped jump-start a new Ottoman Empire and left our friend and ally Israel so vulnerable in this sea of radicalism that he has helped bring to the surface.

How could any of us who were around in '79 not be reminded of President Car-

ter? He has got to be happy—thank you. Now I'm not the worst President in the world. But at the time, he thought we'll just turn our backs on the Shah—not a nice guy, but he was creating some form of stability. When he was gone, President Carter called Ayatollah Khomeini a man of peace.

What a welcome thing.

He came in, and he was the supreme leader when our Embassy was attacked, which is an act of war—just as it was in Libya, just like it is in Cairo. It's an act of war. Any commander would make it clear, except President Carter and President Obama, that you've attacked American soil. You've attacked us. Under everybody's form of international law, you either straighten it out, or we're coming in because we have a right under international law to protect ourselves, and if it means taking your government out because of what you've done or have allowed to be done or have helped foment, then we do it.

□ 1350

In Egypt, this administration helped bring about what they thought would be a great thing, an Arab Spring. It's turned into an American winter. At the same time, this administration was blessing and loving the Occupy Wall Street movement, even though they were clearly a bunch of Democrats, a bunch of kids with iPads, iPhones out there. There was rape, drugs, all kinds of illegality and immorality out there abounding. This administration is saying this is a good thing.

You see the signs all over the place. Let me show you. At the Occupy movement, you would see signs like this: ACAB, all cops are—some people said “bad,” but I've been corrected. The B stands for something to do with fatherless children. ACAB, that's at the Occupy Oakland movement. You can look at pictures and see all these Occupy movements and see ACAB everywhere.

Well, I was a little shocked when my staff points out, Look at that. This was on a wall in Egypt, and I need somebody to explain how, among all this Arabic writing by the radicals that have charged our Embassy in Egypt, how in the middle of all this Arabic do we get ACAB? Who's doing that? There were rumors of some type of collusion, but who among those radicals in Egypt is writing ACAB, which is what you see at all the Occupy movements in America? Somebody has got some explaining to do, I would think, but not to this administration, because this administration thinks both the Occupy movement and the Arab Spring are a great thing, even though it's brought to power radicals who want to destroy America, who want to destroy Israel. How frustrating for our friend Israel.

When we had friends come in here in the last hour, they were talking about Fannie and Freddie. On a personal basis, I like BARNEY FRANK. He is a brilliant guy. But it's not that hard to go back and find quotes from him

about the wonderful condition that Fannie and Freddie were in, and it's not hard to find people here on Capitol Hill that can explain how he stood in the way of the reforms that some here on Capitol Hill wanted to do.

We also heard from him that in 2010, that there was a bunch elected that don't understand Congress and a free society. They were called “extremists.” These freshmen that came in saying, You know what? Everybody should pay their fair share. It shouldn't be 51 percent of Americans paying for everybody else just because Democrats want to keep people beholden to them so they'll keep voting for them. Once they get more than half of all the voters who are getting more than they're putting in, we've lost the country. It will be in complete demise. It may be 10 years or so, but once we get to that point, historically, you do not get that country back. We would not either, absent a miracle of God.

We were told during the conventions that the Republicans do not have a franchise on God. Everybody at the Democratic convention was saying, We love God; we worship God; we love Israel; we like Jerusalem as a capital. We heard all this stuff until there was a vote, and, holy cow, we saw plain and clear that everybody in the Democratic convention does not want God mentioned. They don't want to hear about God. They don't want to hear about Jerusalem being the capital of Israel. They don't want it. They apparently side more with the Palestinians than they do those who were possessing and in that land 1,600 years before there was a man ever talked about named Muhammad is all you can figure. King David was there in Hebron, which now we're told, Oh, do the Israelis have history in this land? It's where David ruled for 7 years, about 16 to 17 centuries before anybody had ever heard of Muhammad. How would they not have a history in that land?

I was talking to Prime Minister Netanyahu about the history in the land. He mentioned the story of Ben-Gurion, who led the ragtag forces to fight their way back to Jerusalem after overwhelming forces had driven them out. The story was—and this was the first I had heard it, was when the Prime Minister mentioned it to me, but I've heard it a number of times since. He said Ben Gurion was challenged with, What is your voucher for claiming this land? And Prime Minister Netanyahu used the word, “Bible.” I'm sure it was a Torah. He said that Ben Gurion held up a Bible and yelled, This is my voucher.

Do they have a history in the land? How blind do you have to be to not see it?

With cap-and-trade legislation, thankfully, we had just a handful of enough friends on the Democratic side of the aisle that we were able to stop that, or it would have tripled or quadrupled the price of gasoline. It would have devastated industry. Industry

would have had to leave in even bigger numbers from this country.

We were told about the Bush stimulus, that they got bipartisan votes on the Bush stimulus. I guess so. Any time either party talks about giving away other people's money, we're going to get a bunch of Democrats to go along with the Republicans that mistakenly agree to that.

While standing right here in this aisle as he came by, I asked President Bush a question. We had found out that \$40 billion of the \$160 billion Bush stimulus was going to go to people as rebates, even though they didn't pay an income tax. Standing right up there, that's when I asked the question: Mr. President, how do you give a rebate to somebody that didn't put any bait in? It's not a rebate. It's welfare. Call it what it is.

My friends across the aisle in the last hour said they couldn't even get 100 votes to support President Bush's effort to save the economy. He's talking about TARP. I would have supported President Bush's efforts to save the economy, but unfortunately that really good man, smarter than most people around here give him credit for, witty, clever, just a joy to be around, but the problem there was he listened to Hank Paulson and his cronies who were going to bail out their buddies who give four to one to Democrats over Republicans. That's what happened.

Paulson did get his way, but we didn't have 100 people on the Republican side of the aisle vote for that because there was a former FDIC Chair named Isaac. He and a bunch of economists had some recommendations. These were free market recommendations. The projection was even then that we have at least \$700 billion in banks overseas that American companies and American individuals had earned overseas. They know that if they bring it into the U.S., they'll have to pay 40 to 50 percent tax with all of the interest and penalties, so they just leave it in banks overseas. They'd love to bring it in here, but we're the only country that double taxes because we don't let people bring in money without hammering the heck out of them, even though they've done a favor, done a good thing and earned money overseas that they'd like to bring here into America.

Proposal-wise, all you have to do is say that instead of borrowing 41 cents to 42 cents out of every dollar and coming up with \$700 billion to give away to Hank Paulson so he can enrich his friends under that bill—I read it. It was a disaster. I couldn't vote for that, because I read it. It would let him give money to anybody he wants to, loan money to whoever he wants to, pay more than fair market value if, in his mind somehow, some way, some day, it might have some possible way of helping our economy.

We don't do that in America, and that bill did it. That's why you didn't have 100 votes on this Republican side

of the aisle for it. Our leadership made a mistake in supporting it on that Friday. I just call them like I see them. That was a mistake, but that's where we are.

□ 1400

We heard, in the last hour, about Republicans who say my way or the highway. Are you kidding me? We reached across the aisle during ObamaCare, saying, look, there's a bunch of these things we can agree on, insurance for people in your household under 26. We could do it for insurance across State lines. There were a number of things we could agree on.

Insurance companies shouldn't be able to punish people for having a pre-existing condition when the insured has acted in good faith all along the way and the insurer messes them around. We were willing to work things out. They said, we've got the votes. We don't need your votes, we don't want them.

Well, the truth is we want Democratic votes on the Republican side, but we don't want to keep taking other people's money to give it away. I have heard in here so many times, well, you know, Jesus talked about helping other people, the orphans and widows. Well, a lot of us belong to churches, and we believe in doing that, that that is what Jesus said to do.

But I can't find anywhere in the Bible where it says, go ye, therefore, take somebody else's money—because you don't want to do your own—take somebody else's money and help the widows and orphans and other people. He said you do it, you help them. When you do that, I can personally tell you, when you do that you're individually blessed. That's why Jesus said he knew it would bless the giver more even than the one who received the gift.

In fact, you want a real example, what did Zacchaeus do after he met Jesus? He went and cut taxes. We don't even have to get into the fact that he was going to give a 4-1 rebate, did, to the people that he had wronged. You don't hear that around here.

To continue to hear our friends talk about ending Medicare as we know it, that disastrous ObamaCare bill will end Medicare forever when you cut \$716 billion. When you create this ObamaCare monstrosity, it's a government takeover of so many things, and it's disastrous.

Yes, we're having to leave here, and I'm not happy about it. I didn't want another CR passed. We should have demanded that this Democratic majority at the other end of the hall stick around until they got a budget as the law requires them to do and don't leave until you do it, and let's stay here and get it.

I can promise my friends across the aisle that all we have to hear is any inclination that the Democrats, controlled by HARRY REID in the Senate, as dictated by President Obama down Pennsylvania Avenue, if they want to

work a budget out together, and we can work these things out together, we will come back in a heartbeat. We will be ready to go.

We saw with that supercommittee, just as I predicted in July of last year, they didn't want an agreement. Apparently my friends who were talking in the last hour didn't know, but PAT TOOMEY and some others made a proposal that would have caused more taxes to have to be paid by the wealthiest in the Nation. The top 1 percent paid 39 percent of the taxes. Well, if they get 39 percent of the income they should, but they only get 13 percent of the income.

They wanted them to pay more. There was a proposal in good faith by Republicans, we'll raise revenue, and it was reported here locally that, gee, some of the Democrats said, you know, this may do the trick. We may get to an agreement now. This is great. Thanks for doing this. Since you're willing to raise revenue on the rich, we can reach an agreement.

Then they go away, and they must have talked to HARRY REID and President Obama, and you can see the game playing. You have got to go back and tell them we're not going to reach an agreement because our best hope for winning the Presidency again and having control in the Senate is if we tell America the Republicans won't reach an agreement, they are a do-nothing group. I hope and pray people will look beyond that and see who really is the do-nothing.

We have got jobs bills down the hall. This ought to be a day of renaissance. This ought to be a day when the economy is booming. We now know we could be exporters of energy. We could be energy independent and export energy. But this President has a war against all of the below—that means all of the energy below the ground—that we could be using and exporting. He has got a war against it. All he is in favor of—as he said, he is for all of the above—that means wind and solar.

Well, guess what? The sun doesn't always shine, the wind doesn't always blow. So if that's what you want for energy it means you are going to have a coal plant, a natural gas plant, something, a hydroelectric plant, and then you are going to have two or three times as many transmission lines.

When you mandate wind and solar, and they don't provide energy all the time, they can't, then you are going to have a source from somewhere. Now we are doubling and tripling and going to force the price of energy to go up because we're going to demand Solyndras and that kind of thing so this administration can reward their cronies.

We're at trouble within and without. I just want to remind my friends, this was reported in The New York Times, December 9, 2008, "5 Charged in 9/11 Attacks Seek to Plead Guilty".

At the start of what had been listed as routine proceedings Monday, Judge Henley said he had received a written statement from

the five men dated November 4 saying they planned to stop filing legal motions and “to announce our confessions to plea in full.”

They were pleading guilty. We got the transcript. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed admitted guilt. He admitted. He confessed to all kinds of heinous kinds.

Then this administration, President Obama and Eric Holder announced they want a New York City show trial that would have endangered New York yet again, as if they hadn't had enough trauma, and would have put a trial in there. Immediately these guys withdraw their plea. We're not going to plead guilty, we can get a show trial in New York. These guys who are running things here don't know what they're doing. What a disaster that would have been.

As far as the great contribution, the great work that's being done in Afghanistan, we took a war where we were making progress, and here are the actual DOD numbers. You see that under Commander in Chief Bush there were 625 Americans, our precious, priceless men and women, who were killed from October of 2001 to the end of 2008, 625 precious lives.

Bush goes out, President Obama comes in, January of 2009, and by the end of August there had been a subtotal of 1,474 additional American men and women killed under Commander Obama. Not only that, 14,817 people had been wounded, Americans had been wounded, lose arms, lose legs, disastrous disabilities, under Commander Obama as compared to the 2,638 terrible wounds that were inflicted on Americans under Commander Bush.

Our President has been in command of 70 percent of the deaths in Afghanistan, though he has been commanding half the time, and has 84 percent of the wounds.

The parents of one of the SEAL Team 6 that was killed on the Chinook August 6 of 2011, they were in the briefing. They have said this publicly, that's why I will say it again. One of the parents asked, “If this was so terrible, this was such a hotbed, you knew it was a hotbed, a lot of aircraft, American aircraft have been fired on recently, why would you allow this Chinook to go in? Why wouldn't you send in a drone?”

The answer from the general who was doing the briefing, they said was, because we're trying to win the hearts and minds in Afghanistan. You're letting our SEAL team be killed when you are trying to win the hearts and minds? That's not the job of the military. The military's job is to go in, defeat an enemy, and come out, and we've got to get back to that.

This President has presided over 70 percent of the deaths in Afghanistan, a disastrous job. It's time to bring the President home, as well as bringing our military home. We could just say what President Bush did in October of 2001. We are going to provide embedded troops. We are going to let the enemy of our enemy be our friend. Not to this administration; they are the enemy.

The enemy of our enemy is our enemy to Obama. But I have met with them a couple of times this year. They are our friends.

□ 1410

They're Muslim. They're our friends. They don't want to live under the tyrannical rule of the Taliban. And they're willing to fight, as they have, and die with Americans for that freedom. And so we don't let a renegade group like the Taliban that wants to destroy America be out.

Make no mistake, the Blind Sheikh was the object of release by a candidate named Morsi in Egypt. He said, I want the Blind Sheikh released. When I'm elected president, I'm going to demand and I'm going to get it.

Just a day before 9/11 this year, last week, you had the brother of the al Qaeda leader, Zawahiri, saying he was ready to broker a deal that would prevent lots of violence. He also knew the day before that there was an obscure video nobody had ever seen and wasn't going to inflame anybody, but he knew that his buddies, the Muslim Brotherhood, the Egyptian Government, the Egyptian television stations would convert that, translate that into a language that they would inflame people that they would do violence in the Middle East. And they did. The second day of that broadcasting here is Zawahiri saying, Hey, I can broker a deal. Just release the Blind Sheikh, some other murdering thugs, and we'll work a deal out.

This administration has offered to release other murdering thugs of the Taliban and to buy them an office in Qatar if they'll just sit down and talk. That's not the way you do foreign diplomacy. You reward our friends so others want to be our friends and you punish our enemies so they don't want to be our enemies. This President has it backwards. He said, They'll look at me different because I'm the first President to have ever grown up in a Muslim country—the years he spent in Indonesia. Well, I wonder if that might be true. Maybe they will. Maybe they'll want to be friends.

Well, the proof is in. The approval rating of the United States in those Muslim countries where we've been was 33 percent—which was terrible—under President Bush in 2008. And now under this President we see a report it's now 15 percent, under this guy who was going to be our President and the Muslim countries would love us. They don't. Because in Muslim countries the real people, the people that we really need to reach out to, not the leaders that hate us and want to destroy us but the real people, they respect a country who understands who's their enemy and who's their friend. They have no respect for a country that tries to do what would be the equivalent of a child—and I've been there on the schoolyard, picked on by bullies. I was little growing up. But I can tell you, I had my nose bloodied many a time.

You don't win respect nor love from a bully by giving him your lunch money or begging him to be nice to you. Not only do they not love you, not respect you; they gain even more contempt for you. And that's what we're seeing happen.

This President is trying to buy affection from people who were bullies, who are radical Islamists that want to destroy us. You're not going to get love and affection. You get contempt. It helps other people join in the fight against us. This President is doing great damage to us. And it's time to bring his Presidency to a peaceful, law-abiding end with the election.

Things look tragic around the world unless we have a new Commander in Chief and a new leader who wants to rein in the spending. And one thing I'll promise my colleagues across the aisle, if you want to go back to that runaway spending that was too much in 2008, that Speaker PELOSI presided over and HARRY REID had in the Senate and that ended in the last day of September, you want to go right back to that total amount being spent, I'm with you. I'll vote. I'll do it bipartisan and I'll bring a bunch of people with us and we'll bring down a trillion dollars a year in spending. How about that? That's pretty bipartisan, isn't it? Go back to a Democratic budget of 2008. Well, I offer that. Let's see how many Democrats are bipartisan enough to take us up on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### RHETORIC VERSUS REALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, nearly 4 years ago, Barack Obama was swept into office by the strength of his rhetoric; but the profound difference between Mr. Obama's rhetoric and the reality Americans have actually lived under in his Presidency is something every American has a profound responsibility to understand.

Mr. Obama's rhetoric on jobs and the economy 4 years ago was:

We have to have a President who understands that the essence of the American Dream is a good job.

But the reality under Mr. Obama's Presidency is the highest sustained unemployment since the Great Depression. The percentage of people participating in America's labor market under this Presidency has fallen to 63.5 percent. That is the lowest rate since Jimmy Carter was President 31 years ago. Manufacturing unemployment has fallen to its lowest levels since 1941. The number of unemployed Americans eclipsed 15 million for the first time in history. The number of people forced to work part-time for economic reasons eclipsed 8 million for the first time in history.